

COVER LETTER - Page 1 of 2
571-273-8300

April 10, 2006

To: Office of Petitions
Regarding Patent Application
#10/648,409

On March 10, 2006, I received
Notice of Abandonment. I believe
this is improper for at least two
reasons —

- ① I did NOT receive any Office
letter mailed July 28, 2005,
- ② I did reply, in a timely manner,
to the Office letter received by
me in * early November 2005.
My reply was mailed November 28,
2005, by Express Mail USPS,
and delivered in Alexandria, Va.
at 9:10 AM, November 30, 2005

April 10, 2006
COVER LETTER - page 2

I have discussed this matter with Examiner Janet Wilkens, who says she never received the materials I mailed on November 28, 2005. On March 30, 2006 she suggested I fax these materials, and supporting materials, to you, citing rule 1.181.

Materials in this FAX are :

- ① 9 page handwritten letter Nov 28, 2005
- ② pages #1 and #2, revisions to Specification and Claim
- ③ pages #1 and #2, marked up copy
- ④ USPS Express Mail delivery confirmation
- ⑤ Office letters received by me in Nov 2005, and March 2006.

Thanks,
Steve Smith

FROM : Steve Smith
US Postal Service

PHONE NO. : 324 6123
3/23/2006 12:27 PAGE 001/001

Apr. 11 2006 10:00AM P3
Fax Server

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 11 2006



**UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE**

Date: 03/23/2006

Fax Transmission To: Postal Customer
Fax Number: 503-324-6123

Dear: Postal Customer:

The following is in response to your 03/23/2006 request for delivery information on your Express Mail item number EU39 0659 579U S. The delivery record shows that this item was delivered on 11/30/2005 at 09:10 AM in ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313 to A YOUNG. The scanned image of the recipient information is provided below.

Signature of Recipient: _____
Anthony Young *CJTC*
Anthony Young
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

Address of Recipient: _____
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

Thank you for selecting the Postal Service for your mailing needs. If you require additional assistance, please contact your local Post Office or postal representative.

Sincerely

United States Postal Service

Nov 28, 2005

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia

Regarding Application 10/648,409

Dear Sir:

In July I received a notice of non-compliant amendment. I had a telephone conference with my examiner, Janet M. Wilbers in which she explained what I needed to submit to correct the situation. It was a fairly simple matter; I believed I understood what she wanted, and I made the changes and submitted the requested materials on July 28, 2005. On November 7, 2005 I received a Failure to Acceptably Respond to Notice of Non-compliant Amendment. This notice had items 1, 2, and 4 checked (X) as causing the amended document to be non-compliant. I immediately

FROM : Steve Smith

PHONE NO. : 324 6123

APR 11 2006 11 2006 10:01AM P5

Nov 25, 2005

called my examiner, Janet M. Wilhens. Her voice mail said, "This is Janet Wilhens, it's Nov 4, and I will be back in the office February 3." So I call her supervisor Lena Main to discuss the situation. Essentially she told me that the materials I submitted on July 28, 2005 were unsatisfactory, and that I would have to make corrections, and ② pay \$795.⁰⁰ or \$1000.⁰⁰ +, she didn't know exactly, or my application would be ~~abandoned~~ abandoned. Furthermore, she refused to explain what it meant on the non-compliant notice where it was referring to underlines, brackets, and strikethroughs. She said it was up to me to figure

page 2

Nov 28, 2005

it out, and since I couldn't, then I should hire a lawyer. By this time I'm beginning to think this situation is ridiculous and absurd. We end the conversation. I can't believe that my patent application is going to be rejected because some word is not bracketed or underlined. Don't Wilkens NEVER said anything to me about brackets, underlines, or strikethroughs. But if that is necessary, I certainly can do it. OK, I decide to call Joe Johnson, whose signature and phone number appear on the Nov 7 Failure to Acceptably Respond notice. What a pleasant surprise! Joe Johnson was very courteous, patient, and

Page ③

Nov 28, 2005

helpful. She quickly explained about the brackets, underlines, and strikethroughs, and about exactly where to put the page number and date, and signature, so that the pages in question (2 pages exactly) would be "compliant." So I have made the requested changes, (it was so simple, it took me about 10 minutes), and I am sending them to you today by Express Mail. I have a big problem with the \$795.⁰⁰. I think it is unfair, unforeseen, and exorbitant under these circumstances, and I will tell you why. ① All the relevant substantive material was submitted as requested in a timely manner,

page ④

Nov 28, 2005

on July 28, 2005, within the 30 days allowed for reply. Any one would have been able to determine what was new or old, and Janet Wilkens, my examiner, who was familiar with the material, certainly knew. If it is just a matter of brackets, or underlines so that you folks can more easily computerize the info, should I have to pay \$735.00?

- ② If there was a problem, why couldn't I have been notified sooner than 3 months? Why couldn't I have been notified in August? Joe Johnson said a 1 month time extension fee was \$60.00 I don't think I should have to pay any time, but \$60.00 is certainly more reasonable.
- ③ My examiner, Janet Wilkens is

page 5

Nov 28, 2005

gone until Feb 3, 2006. I have been told she is on maternity leave. I wonder if she was able to devote full attention to her work as her pregnancy advanced in the hot summer time. At any rate, for her to take 3 months to respond to my July 28, 2005 submission seems excessive. And with Mrs Wilber gone until Feb 3, there is no one who is familiar with my application.

④ I started this process by filing a Provisional Patent Application on August 26, 2002, over 3 years ago. During this period, there have been many communications back and forth between me and the Patent Office. I have ALWAYS responded in a timely manner. The Patent Office usually takes 3, 4, or more months

page ⑥

Nov 28, 2005

to respond in return. So when I didn't get an immediate response to my July 28, 2005 submission, I was not concerned. Janet Wilkens never told me that if she did not approve the materials I sent that my time for reply would end July 31, 2005, regardless of whether I was informed earlier or later. The penalty was totally unforeseen by me.

- ⑤ In addition to not getting all the relevant information from Janet Wilkens, I have been getting conflicting information from Patent Office employees. For example — Yoi Johnson told me to sign each page with my signature and date. She said I needed to do that to make it compliant. She also

page ⑦

Nov. 28, 2005

said to be sure to put the application number on each page.

Fine! No problem! But my examiner Janet Wilkens said it wasn't necessary to put the application number on each page, and she NEVER said anything about a signature. Look, I don't care, I will do it any way you want it. It seems like not everybody is on the same page. I shouldn't be penalized for that.



⑥ Finally, I would like to say that my idea, concept, invention, whatever you want to call it is

page ⑧

Nov 28, 2005

a good thing. Millions of baby-boomers with weak ankles, knees, & hips will be able to extend their mobility. And people of any age will appreciate the upper body exercise benefit of using my invention. I discovered and developed it on my own, nobody else has anything like it, and I deserve a patent for it.

Sincerely,

Steven A. Smith

7

P.S. I have NEVER changed the abstract.

page (9)

7 of 9



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Received Nov 7, 2005

10/648,409
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**Failure to Acceptably Respond to
Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121)
No New Time Period for Reply is Provided**

The amendment document filed on July 28, 2005 fails to provide the corrective action required by the prior Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121) mailed on 7/1/05. The amendment, including both the originally filed amendment and the amendment filed in response to the prior notice, is still considered to be non-compliant under 37 CFR 1.121. In order for the amendment document to be compliant, correction of the item(s) listed below is required. Only the corrected section of the non-compliant amendment document must be resubmitted (in its entirety), e.g., the entire "Amendments to the claims" section of applicant's amendment document must be re-submitted. 37 CFR 1.121(h).

The period for reply continues to run from the mailing date of the prior Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment. The corrections listed below must be timely filed to avoid abandonment of the application. No new time period for reply is provided in this communication. See the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 714.03.

If the period for reply set forth in the prior Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment has expired, this application will become abandoned unless applicant: (1) corrects the deficiency, and (2) obtains an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no case may an applicant reply outside the SIX (6) MONTH statutory period or obtain an extension for more than FIVE (5) MONTHS beyond the date for reply set forth in the prior Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121).

THE FOLLOWING CHECKED (X) ITEM(S) CAUSE THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENT TO BE NON-COMPLIANT:

- 1. Amendments to the specification:
 - A. Amended paragraph(s) do not include markings.
 - B. New paragraph(s) should not be underlined.
 - C. Other: Specification must be submitted with underlines, brackets, and strikethroughs to show changes.
See website below for further explanation.
- 2. Abstract:
 - A. Not presented on a separate sheet. 37 CFR 1.72.
 - B. Other: must include markings to show changes.
- 3. Amendments to the drawings:
 - A. The drawings are not properly identified in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet," "New Sheet," or "Annotated Sheet" as required by 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 - B. The practice of submitting proposed drawing correction has been eliminated. Replacement drawings showing amended figures, without markings, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84 are required.
 - C. Other:
- 4. Amendments to the claims:
 - A. A complete listing of all of the claims is not present.
 - B. The listing of claims does not include the text of all pending claims (including withdrawn claims).
 - C. Each claim has not been provided with the proper status identifier, and as such, the individual status of each claim cannot be identified. Note: the status of every claim must be indicated after its claim number by using one of the following 7 status identifiers: (Original), (Currently amended), (Canceled), (Previously presented), (New), (Not entered), (Withdrawn) and (Withdrawn-currently amended).
 - D. The claims of this amendment paper have not been presented in ascending numerical order.
 - E. Other: Claim I must show brackets, underlines, and strikethroughs to show changes.

FROM : Steve Smith

PHONE NO. : 324 6123

Apr. 11 2006 10:07AM P18

*janet Wilkens ✓ Personal FAX
703 273 6869 given time 3/23/06*

3/30/06

| Received 3/10/06 Notice of Abandonment | Application No. 10/648,409 Examiner Janet M. Wilkens | Applicant(s) SMITH, STEVEN ANTHONY Art Unit 3637 |
|---|---|---|
|---|---|---|

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

This application is abandoned in view of:

- I did not receive*
1. Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on July 28, 2005.
 - (a) A reply was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of _____ month(s)) which expired on _____.
 - (b) A proposed reply was received on _____, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection. (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
 - (c) A reply was received on _____ but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).
 - (d) No reply has been received.

Replied to Nov office letter by USPS Express Mail Nov 28, 2005
 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (b) The submitted fee of \$_____ is insufficient. A balance of \$_____ is due.
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$_____. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$_____.
 - (c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.
 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
 - (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
 - (b) No corrected drawings have been received.
 4. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.
 5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.
 6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on _____ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.
 7. The reason(s) below:

*3/23/06 I called, left message
to please return call
→ phone 571-272-6869*

*JANET M. WILKENS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3637*

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.